

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP COMMENTS
COACHELLA, CA

<i>Date:</i>	June 23, 2005 1:00-5:00 pm	<i>Location:</i>	Coachella Southern Low Desert Resource Conservation & Development Council 53990 Enterprise Way
<i>Meeting Purpose and Goals:</i>	To hear and record public comment on the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005		
All meeting materials, including the PowerPoint presentation, are available at the California Water Plan website at: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm			

Presenters:

Anisa Divine, Advisory Committee member, Imperial Irrigation District

Kamyar Guivetchi, Manager, Statewide Water Planning, CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)

Austin McInerny, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento

Mark Stuart, District Chief, Southern District, DWR

Jack Sullivan, Advisory Committee member, League of Women Voters

Introduction: Format and Purpose

Austin McInerny, meeting facilitator, introduced the presenters and DWR staff and welcomed everyone to the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Public Input Workshop in Coachella. He thanked the Southern Low Desert Resource Conservation & Development Council for providing the meeting facility. The purpose of the meeting was for the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive public input and to share ideas for the Public Review Draft of the CA Water Plan.

The workshop format was interactive. Participants sat in table groups. The meeting consisted of 3 presentations by Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR), each followed by group discussion at each table. Advisory Committee members Anisa Divine and Jack Sullivan spoke on behalf of the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Advisory Committee, and DWR Southern District Chief Mark Stuart gave a presentation on the Colorado River and South Coast Regional Reports, which are located in Volume 3 of the CA Water Plan. Each table station had a DWR staff person who helped record the group discussion on a flipchart. Each table group chose a reporter among themselves who would summarize the group discussion to the entire audience on behalf of the group. Near the end of the meeting, time was reserved for individuals to orally present prepared statements. For a detailed description of the format, see the “Working in Groups” handout.

Part 1 – Agenda Items A and B

A) Background & Overview / B) Comments from the Advisory Committee

This *Water Plan Update* is different than previous updates. It was prepared using a new process. There are many new features in the Water Plan. It will be continually updated as new information becomes available, and it presents a strategic plan and framework for action developed with substantial

stakeholder input. Kamyar Guivetchi spoke on the content and strategic planning process used in the Water Plan. Advisory Committee member Anisa Divine described the diverse and noteworthy membership of the Advisory Committee and the transparent and extensive process DWR used to work with the Advisory Committee and DWR over the years. Advisory Committee member Jack Sullivan explained the *Advisory Committee View*, a 4-page handout prepared by the Advisory Committee that summarizes the areas of agreement and points of disagreement among the 65-member Advisory Committee over the last four and a half years, and uncertainties remaining in the Water Plan.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables in response to these questions::

Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Liked broad involvement. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Liked use of promoting conservation technology at all levels, not just water heads; helpful educational component. + Liked discussion of resource management strategies in Volume 2. + Current draft is much more comprehensive, includes elements that should/can be considered. + The strategic planning process is much more useful and parallels the local/regional water management plans and stakeholder meetings. It is now obvious that many issues are the same at the statewide and local levels. 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Educate the general public about the importance of the Water Plan Update Δ Recommend having regional planning oversight committees to bring together local policymakers to cooperate outside of their jurisdictions. <p>Table 2:</p> <p>No comments.</p>	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are key players involved in the plan? Is the Governor on board? • When you go for wide involvement and breadth, you tend to lose focus on depth, and the exact person you needed to sign on who wasn't there will blow it up...makes you wonder how sustainable the plan will be. • Consider that regions do not have equal resources when suggesting regional self-sufficiency. Operating independently by region is more difficult for some regions than others. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to make decisions without data. • Data is not shared between regions or from region to region. • Modeling issues related to data.

Question & Answer Segment:

Q: Is the Water Plan telling regions to be self-sufficient?

A: Regional self-sufficiency is a concept from Senator Machado's bill, SB 672 (2001). One of the reasons for making the Regional Reports in the Water Plan (Volume 3) is to identify ways to make the regions more self sufficient, that is maximizing resources and minimizing the need to import water from other regions. However, there is no statement in the Water Plan that each region must be completely self-sufficient. This idea is the purpose of the two Initiatives positioned side-by-side on the Framework for Action pyramid diagram: the first Initiative is about the need to have better integrated

water management, the second Initiative is to recognize that we need to have maintenance and coordination of regional systems side by side. It is a statement that no one region in the state can be an island onto itself.

Part 2 – Agenda Items C and D

C) California Water Today & Water Balance / D) Regional Reports

It is important for a strategic plan to have a clear description of current conditions and situations. Chapter 3 of Volume 1: Strategic Plan is called “California Water Today.” As the largest chapter in Volume 1 (about 120 pages), it is intended to provide education and reference information. It gives general findings from both statewide and regional perspectives as well as the perspectives of different water use sectors (agriculture, urban, and environment). Volume 3 of the Water Plan has more detailed information on each of the 10 hydrologic regions (plus additional reports for Statewide, Mountain Counties, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta), covering conditions, challenges, accomplishments, and future opportunities of the Region presented, as well as quantified water balances for supply and use. Kamyar Guivetchi presented the California Water today and statewide water balances, and Southern District Chief Mark Stuart presented the Volume 3 regional reports for the Colorado River and the South Coast hydrologic regions.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables in response to these questions::

Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + The Water Plan is very extensive but not very tight at local level. + Liked explanation of data preparation, DAU analysis. 	<p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Water Plan should give direction to local governments on how to address groundwater impacts from rapid urban development. Δ Suggest reorganization of Colorado River Regional Report; right now it goes back and forth between Colorado River and Salton Sea. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Go from larger to smaller scales. ○ Closed Salton Basin should be addressed by itself. ○ There are other closed basins, and some basins that drain to the ocean. Δ The Colorado River Regional Report says that groundwater makes up 7% of domestic usage – number sounds too low. 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why use so much water for the Salton Sea? Is there any expert who thinks we can save the Salton Sea? • How to mitigate the Salton Sea dust storms? • Why are coastal users getting most water from the desert? • Is there a plan to integrate transportation planning and water planning? • Are there projected impacts of rising water costs? • Need less expensive energy. The Water Plan talks about hydroelectricity and power, but does not give direction on how agencies should try to mitigate fluctuating power costs. • Potential for devastating impacts on water quantity if we

		<p>have entire resources contaminated; several wells in San Bernardino County condemned for perchlorate, conceivably EPA could lower the accepted level and the entire Colorado River could be condemned for certain uses.</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is happening with rapid urbanization and fringe development for agricultural lands—how does that affect groundwater? • Land use planning is important – need to study urban challenges as they impact groundwater. • California Water Plan is not a regulatory document – how would its recommendations be realized? • Landscaping golf courses are high users of water; are local plans addressing conservation of landscape water? • We need to focus on the variables in the regions. • Quality issues – are environmental issues addressed? • Environmental Justice – have the appropriate groups been approached? • Portfolios – are enough years presented to show all conditions?
--	--	--

Question & Answer Segment:

Q: Does the Water Plan discuss the linkage between water quality and supply in the Water Plan?

A: In Chapter 3 of Volume 1 (California Water Today), one of the Challenges is called “Contamination of Surface and Groundwater.”

Q: Does the Water Plan discuss the impacts of urbanization?

A: One of the 25 Resource Management Strategies in Volume 2 is called Urban Land Use Management. We have tried to identify ways where better communication could improve both water planning and urban land use decisions. Given that this is the State’s Water Plan, we understand that land use decisions are made locally. However, there are some State policies and laws that have oversight or would affect implementation, and we have tried to identify those relevant state laws in

Chapter 3. Recently enacted legislation include SB 221 and SB 610 that require more coordination between water agencies and land use planning agencies. Also, the Governor’s Office for Planning and Research put out new guidelines for developing general plans; one of their recommendations is that there be an optional Water Element in general plans.

Q: Are there data analysis units that are more specific than the hydrologic regions?

A: While everything shown in today’s presentation was shown at the larger hydrologic regional levels, the data are developed by dividing the state into 278 subdivisions. Those subdivisions are aggregated into 56 planning areas. On the website, we report Water Portfolio data by those subdivisions, so if someone is really interested, they can look at data by Planning Area.

The website: <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/planningareas/index.cfm>

Q: Golf courses use a lot of water. Are there plans for addressing conservation of irrigation water for golf courses?

A: The Landscape Water Use Task Force was convened early in 2005 that was required by legislation (AB 2717) to come up with recommendations to have more efficient outdoor landscape water use. Golf courses and large landscape are part of that Task Force’s area. That Task Force plans to have recommendations this summer. If they are out in time, we will include those recommendations in the Water Plan. In the Water Plan, “urban use” includes residential, industrial, commercial, large parks, and schools.

Part 3 – Agenda Items E and F

E) Preparing for the Future (Scenarios) / F) Diversifying Responses (Strategies)

This *Water Plan Update 2005* recognizes that many things may alter water use between now and 2030. For that reason, the *Update* contains a description of several possible future scenarios. Uncertainty about future course or events creates a need for multiple options to address opportunities and challenges. Further, the Plan recognizes that one size does not fit all. Each Region will have specific requirements or needs that may not apply across the entire state. Implementing multiple options (diverse management strategies) allows managers to adapt to a variety of circumstances. Volume 2: Resource Management Strategies has narrative descriptions of 25 different strategies available to water managers to help them reduce water demand, improve operational efficiency and transfers, increase water supply, improve water quality, and practice resource stewardship.

Thinking from the perspective of 2030 are there things about this approach to plan for the future you:

Would Change	Don’t Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ More emphasis on water storage. Δ Like strategic plan. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Some concerns need to be addressed like surface and groundwater. Δ Discuss regional supply delivery issues. Δ Data needs – not enough data/data collection, e.g. groundwater extraction. Δ Need more sharing of data. 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we meet needs of an increasing population without additional supplies? • Is reducing Agricultural acres the answer to meeting water needs of population increases? • How much water is running into the ocean? • Why not emphasize more desalination to supply the coast as opposed to taking water from inland? • How do you get 50% water savings from the urban sector? • Will there be enough agricultural land in 2030 to feed people in CA? • There is not enough information to do the strategic

	<p>plan.</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the projections include the impacts that new technologies will make on the numbers? (e.g. total crop acreage) • Hydroponic farming – have we determined its potential? • Studies need to see if hydroponics farming works. • Market trends – time water use to market and growing seasons, using growing seasons in water conservative way. • Water quality strategy – is it included? • Is there data available to examine additional scenarios? • Do you discuss privatization of water supplies?
--	--

Part 4 Additional Public Comments
--

Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Δ Water Plan is thorough; however it is not very tight on the local level. Expect more local documents in future Updates to Prop 50 incentives for integrated resources planning.</p> <p>Δ DWR needs to come up with the data and information necessary to plan out with scenarios and response packages in time for the next-year Update.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Plan is a long term process; but what about emergency plans for short term issues?

Part 5 – Formal Public Comments (in order of presentation):
--

Members of the public were welcome to present statements in the formal style of a traditional public hearing. One member of the public was registered for speaker comments:

Rick Gundry, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs – Southern California Agency:

Mr. Gundry introduced himself as a water rights hydrologist with the Southern California Agency Bureau of Indian Affairs out of Riverside. He stated that this new Update breaks into new subjects with tribal relations. There is one section about ways to deal with more tribal participation in the process; there are other recommendations to assist tribes through funding and to encourage tribal entity involvement in integrated resource management plans. He asked if the State was going to document somewhere in the Water Plan how exactly it will implement the tribal participation, how it is going to assist tribes with access to funding, and how it will involve tribes in IRMPs.

Mr. Gundry asked if Indian trust assets would be handled per the standards set in the CALFED Record of Decision. The United States looks at real property and natural resources as Indian trust assets.

Part 6 – Closing

Kamyar and Austin thanked the audience for participating in the public comment workshop and for their comments. He reminded everyone that the public review period will last through July 22, to allow for 60 days since the release of the printed Public Review Draft document.

The final comment deadline is July 22.

Attendance:

Public:

Don Ackley, Coachella Valley Water District
Zachary Ahinga, Coachella Valley Water District
Tom Burgin, Southern Low Desert Resource Conservation and Development Council
Sam Cobb, Southern Low Desert Resource Conservation and Development Council / NRDC
Bill DuBois, California Farm Bureau Federation
Charlotte Fox, League of Women Voters
Rick Gundry, Bureau of Indian Affairs - Southern California Agency
Steve Hill, U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service
Steve Pastor, Riverside County Farm Bureau
Bruce Rucker, Coachella Valley Resource Conservation District
Patti Schwartz, Coachella Valley Water District

Staff:

Glenn Berquist, DWR
Paul Dabbs, DWR
Robert Fastenau, DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
David Inouye, DWR
Linda Inouye, DWR
Vern Knoop, DWR
Julia Lee, CCP
Mark Stuart, DWR
David Sumi, CCP